DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 436 HE 012 459

AUTHOR Zwingle, J. L.
TITLE Effective Trusteeship. Guidelines for Board Members.
INSTITUTION Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 42p.; Best copy available.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrator Evaluation; Board Administrator Relationship; *College Administration; College Faculty; College Presidents; College Role; College Students; *Governance; *Governing Boards; Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Legal Responsibility; Organizational Effectiveness; *Policy Formation; Role Perception; Self Evaluation (Groups); Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Trustees

ABSTRACT

In this guide trustees and regents are given a description of the special nature of the task of trusteeship, as well as a convenient guide to critical areas of trustee responsibility. Discussion begins with the problems of academic trusteeship: differences in expectations among interested parties--faculty, students, donors, legislators, public officials, parents, alumni, and the press. These issues in governance are outlined: the college as a corporation, the special nature of the academy, policy-making versus administrative functions, the role of the governing board, evaluating trustee performance, attitudes and expectations confronting trustees, pitfalls in trusteeship, and the nature of the trust. Details of the board's operation are discussed: its organization, the need for audits of both financial and overall health of the institution, bylaws, the board meeting, the agenda, responsibilities between meetings, relationships with the college president, presidential evaluation, relationships with faculty and students, faculty and student membership on the board, and relationships with the public. The future of trusteeship is briefly discussed and suggestions are given for bylaws, self-evaluation of boards and board members, and further reading. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164426

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

J. L. Zwingle is the past president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. In this essay, *Effective Trusteeship: Guidelines for Board Members* he shares some of the wisdom he accumulated in a long career as teacher, administrator and college president, as well as in his ten years' leadership of AGB.

Since the first printing of this small treatise in 1975, several basic changes have developed in the academic world, changes already painfully known to everyone concerned with postsecondary education. These new factors, however, do not significantly modify the basic concerns and responsibilities of trustees and regents in the performance of their duties. Revisions in this text therefore are principally those which recognize the growth in literature concerning trusteeship during these recent years.

Foremost among these are the new and enlarged publications of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), which I was privileged to serve during its formative years. And foremost among these publications are those by Dr. John W. Nason, a long-time friend and colleague, who was persuaded to undertake a special task as my own delayed retirement drew near: an analysis and forecast underwritten by the Carnegie Corporation and published under the title *The Future of Trusteeship*. Implied in this study was also the question of the further role of the AGB itself. Having completed that task, to the benefit of everyone, Dr. Nason thereafter has conducted further studies which are referred to in the body of this document and in the lists in the supplement.

In addition, Dr. Richard T. Ingram, vice president of AGB, is responsible for the production of a *Handbook of Trusteeship*. It summarizes (and elaborates) many of the topics which can only be mentioned in this brief commentary.

During the past few years, AGB has experienced a splendid expansion of services in support of those who donate time, thought and energy to the guidance of American postsecondary education.

These guidelines are intended to serve as a quick survey and orientation for college and university trustees, and are born of many years of travail in various areas of education and related activities. It is pleasant to know that it has enjoyed a good reception from those who bear the responsibilities of today and anticipate the prospects for tomorrow.

J.L.Z.
December 1979

© **Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1975. Printed in the United States of America**
Fourth printing,
December 1979

EFFECTIVE TRUSTEESHIP

GUIDELINES FOR BOARD MEMBERS

J.L. ZWINGLE

Until recently, the general public took little interest in academic trusteeship. Suddenly, however, trustees, new or old, find themselves the subject of considerable public concern. This new public attitude is a by-product of several conditions: the vast expansion of higher education in the past two decades, the campus turmoil of the sixties, and the financial crisis of the seventies—itself a product both of financial inflation and the shrinkage in enrollment. Demands upon the time and energy of trustees have expanded; trusteeship is no longer the rather quiet endeavor of former times.

Because of the new emphasis on education and the widely differing views about it, there has been a significant increase in the volume of writings about governing boards for colleges and universities. Reference to some of these will be found in the bibliography for this brief statement, as well as in the text itself. A new publication deserves special mention: *The Handbook of College and University Trusteeship,* edited by Dr. Richard T. Ingram, vice president of AGB. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980). The purpose of this document is to give trustees and regents generally, but the newly appointed trustee and regent in particular, a comment on the special nature of the task and a convenient guide to critical areas of trustee responsibility.

As a start, let us look briefly at the landscape of higher education. There are some 3,000 units of higher education, as calculated by the U.S. Office of Education. These units range from small specialized institutions to large multi-campus universities. As between the public and private sectors, enrollment now is found dominantly in public institutions—about 76 percent. Some 34 percent of the total enrollment is found in nearly 1,000 public two-year colleges. The regional

colleges and universities (such as Kent State University in Ohio, or Central Michigan University) enroll some 20 percent, leaving 22 percent for the state universities and land-grant institutions, and 24 percent for the entire private sector.

This imbalance among the various segments can be misleading. In the variety of offerings, of emphases, of mission, it is incorrect to equate size with importance or to judge various types of institutions by a single standard. Despite justified alarms over the future of the private sector, the importance of the independent institutions may in fact grow rather than diminish. Likewise, the two-year public community college, though not expanding as before, may be reaching new levels of competence—and so on, throughout the scale. The principal concern should be that the strength and vitality of each type be enhanced throughout the severe stringencies of the next period. Therein lies a serious test of American postsecondary education, and particularly of its system of lay trusteeship.

I. Problems in Academic Trusteeship

Not only is there a considerable range in types of institution and in the size of boards, but there is more diversity among trustees than is commonly supposed. Yet while the concerns of trustees at a large state university may seem to differ greatly from those at the small independent college, the differences are more apparent than real. The difference in scale may require a difference in approach, but the essential problems are more alike than many people are ready to admit.

To the extent that differences do exist, let us recognize and deal with them. But at the outset let us examine a few of the problems faced in common by all trustees and regents.

One universal problem is the difference in expectations among parties at interest. The first of these is the faculty—the permanent core of the academic enterprise. Students are the second group having special interests—and then come donors, legislators, public officials, parents, alumni and the press. Each group will have its own definition of good trusteeship and will press its claim. Administrators themselves have expectations of trustees—and vice versa. Each group will feel the heat of controversy and each will lean on the other.

The concept of a governing board as representing the public interest can lead to a special kind of misunderstanding. If an individual board member is to represent some special group, the board itself cannot fulfill its responsibility to the whole public. Otherwise we should be forced to establish formal representation for any group which could muster support for special treatment. Students and faculty members are useful as observers and commentators, but as members of the board of their own institution, they are almost certain to be special pleaders.

These matters must be discussed further, each in turn, but first we should look at some conflicting notions about the essential nature of an academic institution. Without some agreement on that point, an institution becomes just another arena for competing factions.

Among the following concepts, each has its supporters and each has some degree of validity. They are not totally in conflict, though carried to extremes each becomes unacceptable:

The college as a community of students for whose benefit all other groups on campus are organized and who should therefore respond to student interests.

The college as a public agency, to be operated for the public good, responsive to the society of which it is an arm.

The college as a center for vocational or professional training, a source of competent personnel for commerce, industry, government and other social agencies.

The college as a community of scholars.

The college as a business corporation, functioning under an administrator who is responsible to a board.

The college as an agency of the state, supported by the public treasury, subject to the same authority and procedures as other state agencies.

To some extent every institution conforms to each of these ideas, but in differing degree. If an institution is chartered to provide vocational training as its main activity, it should not then be judged as a liberal arts college. Nor should the liberal arts college be confused with a vocational or pre-professional institution.

Yet such confusions do arise, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to decide at what point the program of the institution has gone beyond its proper bounds. One criticism of colleges and universities today is that (with the exception of most of the community colleges) there is too much similarity, that all institutions, small and large, are attempting too much both in volume and in variety. As one trustee has put it, there is a need for both horizontal and vertical diversity.

The first duty of the trustee, then, is to understand the purpose of the institution, to determine direction, and to assist in holding a steady course. Purposes may change with changing times, but changes are matters for serious deliberation and sober judgment. In days of conflict about education—and educators—trustees have a particular obligation to determine the major policies by which their institution shall be guided. In doing so, they of course will seek the counsel of competent professional educators, beginning with the president of their institution.

The College as a Corporation

The college or university is a corporation, in effect, if not in fact. The private institution is established by a charter which vests in a board the responsibility for carrying out the purposes for which the institution was founded. Public institutions are established by legislation, sometimes under constitutional provisions, sometimes not. In any case, the institution is provided with a board which is responsible for the fulfillment of the collegiate program.

But as every trustee should remember, *as individuals, trustees have no legal standing.* The majority vote of the board is the only official basis for action. Individual trustees will have private opinions on many questions, but their personal judgments should be carefully labeled as such and seldom expressed outside of meetings of the board or of the committees. Much better for the individual trustee to use his or her time outside board meetings helping people to understand official board actions than joining in the varieties of speculation and vocalization so characteristic of many colleges.

Trustees can perform valuable services by listening carefully and being reasonably available to those who wish to register opinions. They can be a source of comfort and support (or correction) for many individuals. But they must always be careful to safeguard against misunderstanding of this role.

The Distinctive Nature of the Academy

A common attitude of non-academic people is that there is no significant difference between academic institutions and other organized activities. It is this outlook which has tended to stimulate the suspicions of academic people toward the non-academics who hold power as trustees. Perhaps nothing is more important for trustees than to perceive the differences and to demonstrate in their work as board members that these differences are important to trustees as much as to the faculty and administration.

What then are the differences? They lie not so much in structure as in function. Fiscal soundness is not an index of academic vitality. Fiscal realities cannot be avoided, as everyone learns sooner or later. But for the academy, the really important facts are those which *surround* financial data. A valuable paper to read in this connection is "A Comparison of the University with the Corporation," by Ralph Besse,[1] an experienced trustee who is also an attorney and a former business executive [which appeared in *AGB Reports*]. It formed one chapter of a volume published for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education under the title, *The University as an Organization*.[2] Two other chapters in this volume compare the university with a government bureau and with a large foundation, and a summary chapter by John J. Corson classifies the differences in five categories: purpose, activities, atmosphere, membership, and internal relationships. Here it may be said that the special character of colleges and universities is found in two broad relationships within it: the relationship between students and teachers, and the relationship between these two and the administration. The quality of these relationships provides the best indicator of the real health of the institution.

Policy vs. Administration

Within this setting the board confronts difficult tasks indeed. Perhaps the most difficult is to distinguish between policy and administration, and to understand levels of policy. In an article on "Institutional Policy and Its Abuses," Bogue and Riggs refer to three levels of policy:

> Governing Policy: Those policies of mission and program and general operating conditions set by governing agencies.

1. Ralph Besse, "A Comparison of the University with the Corporation," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 15, No. 3 (November/December 1973).

2. James A. Perkins, ed., **The University as an Organization,** Report to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Executive Policy: Those policies of fiscal, facility and personnel management established by the president and the chief executive officers in response to governing policy.

Operating Policy: Those policies of work environment and expectation set by deans and directors of activities in response to executive policies.[3]

The authors add that "the general function of policy in organization is simple in intent. Policy effectiveness, however, is complicated by its frequent abuse"—by which they mean the misuse of policy to protect status, or as a substitute for administrative courage or good judgment or to cover exceptions. It is a thoughtful essay, worthy of close study by any trustee.

Charles A. Nelson puts the matter neatly:

The art of trusteeship consists largely of discovering and holding the middle ground of policy making, eschewing with equal vigor the posture of mere validation on the one hand and the usurpation of administration on the other.[4]

Stephen K. Bailey, former vice president of the American Council on Education, in conversation with the author, has stated his view of the matter thus: "As a trustee, the test question in separating policy from administration is whether a proposed action will change the nature or direction of the institution or its subordinate structure. If it will, the board should recognize the implications for long-term policy before casting the vote."

The Role of the Governing Board

Trustees have been known to complain about operating under such limitations that decisions are virtually fixed before being brought to the board. Such complaints may be valid, but when valid they represent a failure on the part of the board or of the administration—or both—to reach a sound agreement about their respective roles and to establish simple, clear procedures in support of their roles.

In a number of publications over the past 30 years the role and scope of trusteeship have been analyzed from different points of view. Among the most recent is John W. Nason's "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," an AGB publication which has been expanded as a chapter in the *Handbook* already mentioned. An earlier treatment will be found in a Carnegie Commis-

3. E. G. Bogue and R. O. Riggs, "Institutional Policy and Its Abuses," **Journal of Higher Education**, Vol. 45, No. 5 (May 1974).

4. Charles A. Nelson, "The Lay Trustee—Up or Out?" **AGB Reports**, Vol. 14, No. 7 (April 1972).

sion volume entitled *The Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems.*[5] The Nason list consists of these items:

1. To select and appoint the president.
2. To monitor the president's performance.
3. To determine the mission of the institution.
4. To approve long-range plans.
5. To approve educational program.
6. To insure financial solvency.
7. To defend the autonomy of the institution.
8. To enhance the public standing of the institution.
9. To interpret the community to the campus.
10. To serve as a court of final appeal.
11. To assess their own performance.

Limitations of space will not permit discussion of these points here, but trustees should by all means read the comments offered by Dr. Nason in the publications already available. Clark Kerr's list in the Carnegie Commission book comes to only six items, which might be said to cover the field in a more general way. Kerr summarizes the role of the board in this way:

- To hold and interpret the trust
- To act as a buffer
- To arbitrate internal disputes
- To stimulate change
- To be responsible for financial welfare of the campus
- To provide governance

There is one point in that list, however, which might be thought controversial: the trustee responsibility "to stimulate change." Probably every other campus group feels a prior claim on the right to stimulate change, and feels some resistance to change as stimulated by trustees. Certainly the business of change in the academic world is complex at best, but trustees would do well to ponder their responsibility there. Kerr insists that only the trustees be sufficiently disengaged to exercise the tempered judgment required for this and other sensitive areas of academic planning. In his list of eight tasks for trustees, his emphasis parallels that of Nason, offering one interesting point of obligation: "To be cognizant of new mentalities . . . new attitudes, new motivations, and new interests" among students and faculty.

5. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, **The Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems** (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Evaluating Trustee Performance

At last there appears to be a growing acceptance, even among trustees, that boards themselves should take seriously the need for evaluation, though in the main, trustees continue to neglect this obligation—to their own harm and that of their own institution. It is a sensitive point. If the board itself will not take the initiative, who can? Not the president. Faculty and students may want to, indeed be eager to, but how? Any outsider suggesting such a thing is likely to be seen as a troublemaker. And the board, which tends to regard itself in the best possible light, or is hesitant to seem critical of an individual member, misses the benefits to be derived from a systematic study of this central and invaluable component of the enterprise.

The process of accreditation provides for the institution periodic evaluations, as do many related activities. From time to time, institutional evaluation will reveal a problem in the composition and the performance of a board. Only in extreme cases (sometimes too late) will this review serve to stimulate corrective action.

Fortunately, the concept of periodic evaluation even at the highest levels is taking hold. Procedures and guidelines for board evaluation have been developed. Printed materials are available to the boards willing to undertake the delicate but important task of appraisal. Perhaps the time of self-justification for trustees is drawing to a close. If so, that itself is a sign of better things to come.

Attitudes and Expectations

We began by observing the range of expectations confronting the trustees. But how shall the trustees decide whose expectations they should attempt to satisfy? The answer to this question is both simple and complex. It is simple in the sense that the trustee has only one basic obligation: to exercise judgment on issues of policy without undue regard for pressures or opinions to the contrary; the trustee must then do whatever possible as a member of the corporation to see that decisions are in fact carried out.

The trustee then must choose a set of attitudes toward the task. Over-activity will become self-defeating. Passivity will be unproductive. To attempt to know everything about the institution will be foolish, but to know too little is to be helpless.

To become a productive member of the corporation, the trustee must take time to understand the purposes

of the institution, to develop a vision of its future potentialities, to relate effectively to the other trustees and the administration—not to say other elements of the total community, on campus and off. In the course of time, it becomes possible to help create the most important single factor in institutional success, the spirit of the corporate body—meaning first the board, but also and ultimately all those who are involved and who are committed to high expectations and realistic goals for the institution. An institution in which the major components are divided and in conflict is a crippled institution. The one in which there is spirited controversy but basic commitment is a healthy institution.

Good health should begin with a good board. A strong president may compensate for a poor board, but eventually that president will be gone. Then the cost of weakness in the board will appear, and a high cost it may be. A strong faculty may compensate for weakness in both administration and board, but a strong faculty is not likely to hold its strength if not matched in fair degree by administration or board, preferably both. Weakness in any of these major components will eventually affect every aspect of institutional life, beginning with dissatisfaction of students and ending with loss of public support.

Pitfalls

We have already mentioned these individually, but to summarize: There are three major pitfalls in the way of the conscientious trustee.

1. Failure to understand the nature of the board.
2. Failure to understand the distinctive nature of academic institutions.
3. Failure to distinguish between broad policy and the administrative function.

They need emphasis because even the most experienced and highly placed trustees have been known to violate one or two or even all three of these cardinal guidelines. Board chairmen, committee chairmen and others in responsible positions as board members have overlooked the limitations on individual action by trustees and have placed themselves and their institution in awkward, sometimes vulnerable positions. Every trustee should understand, too, the difference between participating in a board decision by casting a vote and serving as an adviser when called upon.

The Nature of the Trust

The trustee of an estate is responsible for conserving fiscal assets. By the same token, trustees and regents of universities and colleges are assumed to have first, perhaps exclusive, concern with fiscal affairs. If the business side of the institution appears to be sound, what then should concern the trustees? Obviously they should be concerned with the educational program. But how shall they avoid meddling in matters where they are not experts?

Discussion of this troublesome area will be found in the second section of this commentary, but for the moment it is important to acknowledge that the trustee/regent in higher education is responsible for a *process* as well as for *property,* for *activities* as well as for *assets.* It is a sobering thought. How shall the trustee live up to the obligation? The question is especially vexing when one stops to realize that there has never been wide agreement on either the content or the methods of education. But the trustee must begin by accepting the function of the institution as his or her concern, along with the fiscal operation. In fact, the fiscal operation cannot make sense apart from the educational function, including goals, experimentation and those controversies which seem inherent in the academic enterprise.

Three Essentials

To grapple with this range of responsibilities, the board needs to concentrate on three special functions as they bear on the total institution. First is the planning function. The board should not be the planning body, but rather should require adequate planning for all aspects of the institution. Planning is never static, never finished, but must undergo periodic revision as experience dictates.

Given competent planning, the board can perform its next function, that of *authorization.* The third stage is *review.* Planning, authorization, review—these abstract words, obvious in meaning, must each be applied to specific aspects of the institution: enrollment, finance, public relations, procurement and the whole range of support activities which will make or break the institution.

With this seemingly universal task, how shall the board approach the job?

It is one thing to generalize about good organization and good practice but quite another to produce the results. Advice and exhortation are not enough. The magic ingredient is people. Procedures are no substitute for people. Procedures and bylaws can help (or hinder) those who are both able and willing to perform, and may protect an institution from the whims of the wrongheaded and from the sometimes whimsical behavior of well-intentioned but uninformed persons. But a discussion of organization must begin with the assumption that the board and administration are enlightened, energetic and committed to their joint task. If the board or administration is weak or misguided, the problem becomes one of reform rather than of organization. In discussing organization, therefore, provisions for reform must be included. It is a matter of history that strong institutions sometimes fall into disrepair, that weak institutions become strong. Most institutions, however, tend to maintain a fairly steady state until and unless circumstances force a radical change for better or worse. Rare indeed is the institution where foresight has determined a course of action.

Can the Governing Board Govern?

A question which hangs over the entire field of lay trusteeship is whether lay governing boards can provide the central policy function attributed to them or whether they will become subordinated to mere ceremonial roles. In the public sector, the issue is institutional independence. In the private sector, the issue is survival.

In both sectors boards are the target of certain criticisms—that the average age is too high, that the members are from the same mold, that they are disengaged, indifferent, uninformed, passive; that they are guilty of conflict of interest; that they act in secret and are abritrary in judgment. In the attempt to meet these criticisms, actions have been taken which have complicated the function of the board in new ways—"the sunshine laws," over-representation of special constituencies, the tendency of trustees to become managers, and so on. . . . Amidst such cross-currents, only a mature group wisdom can maintain the integrity and continuity so important to institutions.

Before discussing organization of the board, we should note that board members, like everyone else, have individual personalities. Variety in personality types is especially valuable, provided reasonable bal-

ance is maintained. Again we are indebted to Stephen Bailey for an observation on the types of persons needed to provide both variety and balance in trusteeship. Bailey lists four types: *the gadfly, the restrainer, the mediator* and *the philosopher.* The gadfly (one per board may be enough) wants action now, though he sometimes is not greatly concerned about substance. The restrainer calls for deliberation. The mediator helps the other two find a middle ground; and the philosopher asks for some thought about the implications and long-range consequences. Happy is the president whose board contains just the right mixture of these types.

The Organization of the Board

Membership. As between public and private boards, wide variation in size and method of selection makes necessary separate comments on each. In the public sector, the size of the board is determined by legislation. The range in function and responsibility among the public boards is striking. In a single state, there may be a board of 12 members responsible for a multi-campus university enrolling perhaps 40,000 students, with plant, staff and budget to match. The so-called regional colleges and universities in that state may have separate boards of 12 persons—or may be grouped under one board for that special type of institution. The state's community colleges may have separate boards of 12 members each. Thus perhaps 10 community colleges may have local boards with a total membership of more than 100, while the state university and the regional institutions together may have only some two dozen regents. Yet at the same time, that state may have a coordinating board of some 12 or 15 members who have statutory concern for the total program of higher education.

Apart from optimum board size, there is room for question about methods of selection and deployment of citizens responsible for the totality of higher education. The answers to such questions depend primarily on a point of conviction, whether membership on governing boards is worthy of as much care in recruitment as would be expected in the selection of, for example, a member of the state supreme court. Granted that a volunteer cannot be expected to meet professional criteria, it is not unreasonable to expect of regents and trustees the highest degree of experience and probity. There are outstanding examples of high quality in boards of regents.[6] The system as it now

6. Earl F. Cheit, "Regent Watching," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 13, No. 6 (March 1971).

operates, however, does not assure protection against the dominance of political factors in the selection of regents. Nor is there evidence of efforts toward strengthening the citizen's role in formulating institutional goals. At the same time, especially among newer institutions, there is need for *more statesmanship and less intervention in institutional affairs* on the part of regents.

In the private sector, with relatively few restrictions on the selection of board members, there is nevertheless great variation in board size—and quality. Here the possibilities are open for improvement both in organization and role, given a willingness to deal with the issue. But among the private institutions board meetings tend to be fewer, the agendas more stereotyped, and the role of the trustee too passive.

Generally speaking, in both the public and private sectors, the tendency among boards is to concentrate on the performance of the president, on the financial health of the institution and on the level of public approval. Put another way, the absence of crisis is taken to indicate good health.

Quite apart from questions of size and of organization, the method of selection stands out as the paramount issue. As a result of a survey indicating general agreement on the need for improvement, a new study is now under way. Supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, AGB has appointed a National Commission on Trustee Selection. The work of this commission should produce better guidelines for both the public and the private sectors, and even perhaps some consensus about the need to follow such guidelines. The only reason for emphasis on this point here is that trustees now in office can well afford to show concern for the composition of their own boards and for the process of selection now in force.

Deployment. The question next arises, how best should a board be organized to serve its purposes? How many committees? How many meetings? What sort of agenda?

Starting with the fact that a board is legally and morally responsible for the long-term welfare of the institution, the board has no limit on the range and depth of its concerns. But the board cannot succeed if it tries to do everything. It therefore must depend on the president and the staff for recommendations. It is no service to the president, however, simply to adopt recommendations without scrutiny and discussion, and without expenditure of time before formal meetings to assure an adequate grasp of issues. Thus committee work becomes urgently important.

How many committees? The best answer is the min-

imum necessary to get the job done. Depending on the size of the board, and the importance of involving every member in some aspect of committee work, the number of committees will still depend on objectives —work to be done. Non-functioning committees are probably worse than plain under-involvement.

On the subject of standing committees, there is considerable agreement that the fewer the better. In a letter to the author, President John W. Oswald of The Pennsylvania State University takes a strong stand against executive committees in particular:

You mention an executive committee as apparently an important part of a board. This is not the case on many boards. Indeed, many boards have run into great problems over executive committees which have essentially taken the authority over in such a way as to make the rest of the trustees either angry or disinterested. It is my judgment, having dealt with three boards, that an executive committee is a minus rather than a plus. I do recognize that for a private institution having 50-60 trustees an executive committee is necessary; but in those cases I have often wondered why the institutions didn't call the executive committee the governing board and identify the rest as a board of visitors or some other name.

Others have objected to standing committees altogether, on grounds that they tend to become "administrative"—to forget, that is, their subordinate relationship to the board and to assume powers of decision. Examples come easily to mind. But the cure for one extreme case is not necessarily a leap to the opposite extreme.

If a board is small enough and easily accessible, perhaps there is no need for an executive committee. For these boards, the agenda itself can become a problem—too much for too few. It is the author's view that virtually every board for a state-related institution urgently needs supplementary groups to give responsible advice and assistance in many areas of university affairs.

Almost any board could settle for four standing committees: an executive committee, a nominating committee, a committee on educational affairs, and a committee on finance and audit.

In addition, however, ad hoc committees should be appointed in accordance with the needs of the institution. These needs will be determined by the current priorities demanding attention. Board committees can be expanded to include representation of various special interest groups or to include individuals of special competence to assist with a problem or project. By this

means, students, faculty, alumni, government officials and others can be brought into the councils of the institution without tinkering with the authorized structure and without encumbering the institution with an overburden of persons with vested interest in the decision.

Such committees should have clear terminal dates. An ad hoc committee should have a categorical assignment and a specific life span. The wise use of such committees will make possible wide consultation and involvement without freezing the institution into an organizational mold. The object is the "developmental outlook" earlier mentioned, the marshalling of human resources. This approach is open to every type of institution, public or private, small or large.

Needed: Two Kinds of Audit

But beware. . . . Unless some minimal funds and staff time are made available to ad hoc committees, they will almost certainly not produce. There is an inescapable connection between the quality of volunteer services and the adequacy of staff allocation. America is a country justly proud of its tradition of volunteer activity, but the efficient application of volunteer efforts remains in a primitive stage. All eleemosynary institutions—hospitals, museums, galleries, churches—represent the achievement of some voluntary effort. Yet the typical history shows that after the first efforts to establish a going concern, a period of slack sets in. Thereafter institutions tend not to develop organically, so to speak, but to lurch and lunge, to rise and subside, to waken for a space and then slumber.

Therefore one must conclude that institutions need two kinds of audit, one conventional, the other not. The financial audit is understood. What is not well understood is that the financial audit may be misleading, or at least inadequate. A requirement for such an audit in three-year periods might well be included in the bylaws (to be discussed next). Whereas accrediting bodies give a periodic audit of the academic quality of an institution, only the governing board can invite an audit of itself and of the total health of the institution. Such an effort would call for an unusually open attitude among trustees and administration. It would involve an unusual array of talents on the part of the auditor or auditors. But surely it can be done. The manual of operations could serve as an audit guide or checklist. Hindsight tells us how institutions might

have avoided the trauma of many a bad experience. Perhaps better foresight might avoid others. *Such an effort depends almost solely on the board.* Disengaged from the daily demands of operations and the daily pressures of individuals and groups, the board is in position to press for priorities, both short-term and long-term. Together with the president, the board has a concern for the total institution. If the board fails in this fundamental duty, everything else will suffer.

Bylaws as a Chart for Organization

There are those who hold bylaws in such high esteem they wish to have them to record every function of every department and subdepartment of the institution. But the more detailed the bylaws the more often they will need revision—and this is not an easy thing to do. Despite the standard provisions for change, some kind of mind-set makes for difficulty in revising bylaws, which are but a supplement to the charter, specifying what may not be declared in the charter allocating responsibilities for the work of the board.

Thus, the simpler the bylaws, the less probability of obsolescence, the more flexibility for board and administration—provided the bylaws require the president and the chairman of the board each year to record the current plan of organization of the college and the board. It may be surprising to some persons that bylaws are not usually even a legal necessity, though in case of litigation the courts may require some official document allocating duties among trustees and officers of the institution.

Hence, there are relatively few points required for inclusion in bylaws, provided the board and administration adopt a statement of duties from time to time indicating the current state of organization. The bare necessities for bylaws are offered in Section IV of this paper.

In addition, a set of model bylaws can be procured from AGB headquarters. It is a document offering major sections of important matters to be covered in such bylaws, without attempting to cover special conditions in every possible circumstance.

Still there remains to be solved the human side of the problem: the need to see the bylaws as an operational supplement to the charter which is properly subject to change as often as necessary. Instead, bylaws are approached as if the task were comparable to open-heart surgery. When finally voted, bylaws then tend to be neglected as a practical tool until it comes to

light that practice and guidelines are once more out of gear. Let the bylaws be simple, and let the board see to the currency of administrative organization, with minimum need for documentation and maximum clarity.

The Board Meeting

In one sense, the board of trustees/regents can be said to exist only during the time of meeting. During that time, full authority and responsibility rest upon the group. Actions taken become a part of the record of the institution, a part that can be changed only by later actions of the board. Between meetings, individual trustees have other opportunities to serve the institution, a topic for a later section.

The meeting itself can be short, yet constructive; or short and perfunctory; or long, tedious and disruptive; or long, systematic and regenerative. The meeting is but a means to an end. A meeting which yields personal satisfaction to those present may be a good thing, but not if that is its principal accomplishment.

A study of board performance in 19 state-related colleges over a ten-year period confirmed some long-standing sispicions: 1) that much meeting time was consumed in matters that could have been handled otherwise; and 2) that over a period of ten years there had been no major change in board concerns.[7]

Industrial boards of directors come under fire from time to time because they are dominated by insiders or by persons from other corporations sharing the same interests and outlook. Academic boards, on the other hand, are criticized for domination by outsiders who do not understand the substance of the enterprise. In both cases the board is in danger of being an echo chamber. It is safe to say that most board meetings stand in need of improvement. Rare is the report of satisfaction with the typical board meeting. Granted that some member or other will always be less than happy over a particular meeting, it is possible to conduct board meetings so as to provide satisfaction for the members and, more important, creativity for the institution. Bringing about the necessary change depends on a chairman and a president who are willing to act.

The Agenda

The agenda of most board meetings is either too full or too random. There are usually three types of material to be covered: 1) validation of actions taken by

7. James Gilbert Paltridge, "Folklore and Some Facts About Trusteeship," **AGB Report,** Vol. 16, No. 6 (March 1974). Adapted from Paltridge, et. al, **Boards of Trustees: Their Decision Patterns** (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California/Berkeley, 1973).

the administration or by the executive committee; 2) information about principal activities within the institution, consisting of reports from officers and committees; and 3) authorization of new actions recommended by officers or committees. If these routine matters can be handled expeditiously, a valuable fourth item can be added: discussion of current policy concerns—enrollment, finance, student and faculty demeanor or public relations.

Paltridge's study, though limited to state-related institutions, confirms the experience and observations of many people in every type of institution: that too much board time is spent on detail or trivia, that discussion tends to become disproportionate to the importance of the issue or to the time available. A board made up of unpaid volunteers meeting infrequently has built-in problems of discipline; it is not easy for its members to keep informed, yet operational discipline and shared information are essential.

It is certainly possible to organize a board meeting so that time can be allocated according to the importance or urgency of a matter (a matter can be urgent without being terribly important). If the executive committee has substituted itself for the board, as sometimes happens, the board meeting may be taken up entirely with a report and validation of the various actions of the executive committee. If on the contrary the executive committee has left something important for the board to do, time may be economized by designating one or two members to study the actions of the executive committee and of the administration, summarize the actions and offer a motion of validation. Thus the time of the board will be saved for major items of current importance. At least items for validation can be separated, reserving for discussion those matters that require it.

An agenda can be organized to reflect the degree of policy implication for various types of action, so that the board can readily see where major attention should be directed. To convey a sense of continuity, the board would profit from the use of an annual forecast of topics to be discussed at future meetings. While each agenda cannot be detailed far in advance, major topics can be identified.

A simple visual aid can be of great help to a board, yet very few maintain a flow chart or other graphic representation of actions previously taken. Such an aid can provide many benefits. It can, as has been mentioned earlier, function as a *review*. Many boards have unwittingly taken actions which contravene

actions taken in a previous meeting. A chart can help provide the basis for "status and outlook" reports on actions previously authorized.

In the press of immediate considerations, boards sometimes overlook matters that only need periodic review. The curriculum, the college year and calendar, proportions of resident and commuting students, leaves and vacations, sabbaticals, appointment procedures, disciplinary and parietal rules, and a hundred other matters fall mainly within the competence of the administration and faculty, but from time to time need policy review by the board. To insure that these matters are not overlooked, it is good practice for a board to compose a checklist. This checklist may be included in a handbook or manual incorporating the bylaws, adopted policy statements and other materials useful for reference by both new and experienced board members.

The substance of the matter rests on a few clear points. The dynamics of board meetings will largely be determined by the competence of the chairman and the president, their close cooperation and their willingness to make sure that board members are energized rather than bored or distracted by the meeting. None of this is possible if the institution has not set itself on a sound course of short-term and long-term planning to which everything can be related.

Essentially, the volunteer board member will find a reward in the sense of participating in work which outreaches one life span, contributes to the advancement of human beings individually and at large, and maintains a vital function for the benefit of society. Otherwise, board service becomes just another ego trip.

Between Meetings

When the board meeting adjourns, the board member may have been assigned duty on either a standing committee or an ad hoc committee; or the member may be without assignment. In either case, between meetings the member has a duty. It is to maintain a lively interest in the institution, to broaden his or her understanding of educational issues, and to expose the mind to basic relevant information which will improve judgment.

If a board member's attention is concentrated on the college only at meeting time, the results cannot be good. If the institution is secondary to many other

competing interests, the results cannot be good. Those who accept board membership should place it in rank immediately after personal and occupational demands. And few people have the time or capacity to deal with more than two or three high-ranking commitments to volunteer undertakings.

Trusteeship, like all important undertakings, is an art to be cultivated rather than a technique to be learned. It is a wise person whose self-understanding leads to good performance of the right role as a member of a board.

Apart from official duties, board members have much opportunity to help the institution. But they should bear in mind three provisos:

First, that any informal service they undertake is reasonably coordinated with other efforts in the same area of interest.

Second, that the informal activity is authorized by somebody and reported from time to time. The authorization can be either by the board or by the president but should not be operated ad lib. Otherwise, the result may take the form of frustration, misdirection, friction and disaffection.

Third, that the board member not engage in professional practice for the college, either by contract or as a volunteer. The architect, lawyer, insurance agent or engineer should have valuable judgment to offer; but for the college to rely on either paid or volunteer services from board members not only involves a conflict of interest but usually spells distress for the institution. Building committees should not design or redesign buildings, though they can recommend acceptance or rejection of designs.

Lawyers in particular would do well to heed the words of a distinguished commentator, experienced in the world of trusteeship. Nils Y. Wessell, in an address to an AGB conference, referred to the "stickler" as one type of trustee who impedes the work for the board. Coining the word "doicot" for "the dotter of i's and the crosser of t's," Wessell states that most of the doicots in his experience were lawyers.[8]

The learned professions in general tend toward the technical approach to problems, and by training lawyers are the most inclined that way. Of course there are outstanding exceptions, exemplified by such persons as Laird Bell (Chicago lawyer and trustee of the University of Chicago and of Carleton College), a long time leader among trustees, and others still active.

With these caveats in mind, informal services in fund raising, public relations, student recruitment,

8. Nils Y. Wessell, "Board-President Relationships: Second Thoughts," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 16, No. 4 (January 1974).

trouble shooting, can be invaluable. Judgment, coordination, style: these are the keys. Rightly done, informal activity between meetings may be more important than anything else. It is an individual role, except for committee work. And it should make for better trusteeship.

The Board and the President

According to a well-worn, simplistic and incorrect view, the academic president is the counterpart of any other chief executive—the manager of the enterprise, the agent of the board, serving at the pleasure of the board. For success, he or she is rewarded; for failure, he or she is discharged. Thus the agenda of the board may be said to consist basically of one item: affirming or denying confidence in the president.

True, the president is the key figure; but the task of the academic president is essentially different from that of other corporate executives. It is more comparable to a political role than to corporate administration. This view is finding more and more acceptance, but it needs wider understanding.

Given the peculiar nature of the academic institution, the president is constantly in danger of becoming everybody's target, to be seen as an adversary by every group—faculty, students, alumni, donors, even with the trustees. He or she is of course primarily the agent of the board. Success, however, depends on maintaining constructive relationships with all groups, even when he or she must oppose one or more of them (including the board itself).

Presidents should be both leaders and managers, but any one person may be better in one role than in the other. Therefore the board needs to make sure that both needs are met in the total staffing of the central administration. The board should not abdicate responsibility for this delicate matter, leaving it all to the president. That is to say, the relationship between board and president should be such that at least some members of the board, beginning with the chairman, can effectively review with the president all matters affecting the forward movement of the institution without invading presidential functions.

The most important functions of the president are to conceptualize, persuade and mediate. In these respects, the board is the first and last means of cohesion.

Except for unusual situations, the president should speak for the institution. To the extent that someone

needs to speak for the board, it is essential for the president and the chairperson to reach an understanding about respective roles. To the extent that the chairperson as spokesperson does not appear to invade the functions of administration, the chairperson can serve a good purpose as voice for the board—giving visibility to the board and serving as a buffer for the president.

We have been thinking of relationships between the board and the president without recalling that somewhere along the line that president was selected by someone. So important is the act of selection that it is being given new emphasis. New writings have appeared to assist all those involved in the process. Most recently AGB has published *Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents* by Dr. John W. Nason, whose work was underwritten by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. That document carries references to other writings in the field and should prove invaluable to those who will take to heart its wide range of information and insights.

Evaluating the President

Today the evaluation of presidents is becoming a matter of increased interest. It is important that efforts to evaluate be reasonable and realistic. Just as board members cannot embody all the virtues, neither can presidents. There are two clear but elusive standards for evaluation of presidents: 1) whether the office is being conducted according to understandings reached at the time of appointment; 2) whether on balance the institution is maintaining vitality. Board members should remember that in evaluating a president, the board is also evaluating itself, both as to judgment in the original appointment, and as to its own performance during the tenure of the president. In any case, the evaluation of a president probably needs the assistance of a competent outsider or an outside committee, that can assure a degree of objectivity and perhaps some mediation of differences.

On the use of an outsider and on the purposes of evaluation the author has encountered some serious questions. Naturally, the usefulness of the outsider depends on two factors—the condition of the board and the competence of the outsider. In a matter as delicate as presidential evaluation or board evaluation, self-study tends to become either self-fulfilling or self-defeating. Evaluation itself can be and often is

used for devious purposes. Assuming honesty of intent, however, it is still very hard for any group to be objective, thorough and accurate about its own affairs.

Noteworthy for all trustees is a new AGB publication, *Presidential Assessment,* by Dr. John W. Nason, which offers a full treatment of this subject, as a companion piece to *Presidential Search*.

When all the processes of evaluation have been completed, however, it still remains a matter for board decision whether it chooses to stand with a president and support his or her work. Sometimes the decision on support is difficult, for example when the president is in conflict with the faculty, as in the recent case of a professional school faculty that voted a resolution of no confidence in their dean. The president backed the dean; the board met, considered the case and backed the president.

The Board and the Faculty

The academic institution has one primary function, the education of students. The functions of research and public service are accepted but secondary. In education, certain exceptionally strong teachers will play an important role. But even more important is the mood and style of the total faculty—especially those holding tenure. While the president is the agent of the board, he or she should also be seen as an effective leader of the faculty and a spokesperson for their concerns. Since the board is in most institutions an absentee group, and since there is natural curiosity, even distrust, of the absentee who is also a lay person, it is wise for the president to arrange for periodic meetings of representatives of both faculty and the board. It is a test of confidence on all sides when such an arrangement is acceptable, but it should not become routine practice.

In such sessions, it is aboslutely necessary that the board members understand the boundaries of discretion. The objective should be the opportunity for expression of faculty views. If beforehand it is clear that a board position needs expression, for whatever reason, the president and the board should understand what is to be said by whom. Otherwise, confusion will be worse confounded. In any case, the important thing is the welfare of the total institution, not the pacification of one element.

Should board members converse privately with faculty members? Since as a practical matter it is bound to happen, the real question is whether every board

member knows how to avoid a seeming commitment. Unless a board member has been delegated to talk privately with a member of the faculty, for special reasons, he or she can actually only listen. If the board member should offer an opinion, it will almost certainly be accepted as official, no matter what the disclaimers.

The foregoing statement may seem too restrictive. Certainly board members as individuals can be very useful to individual faculty members when both are dealing with common professional or personal interests. In that sense, there is no limit to the amount of exchange which might prove beneficial. Of greatest importance is the preservation of the distinction between official representations and unofficial and personal exchanges. Easy for some, impossible for others.

The Board and the Students

Important as the faculty must be in any academic situation, the student can hardly be put in second place. The student after all is the first reason for everything, and there have been abuses in the past of student rights. Yet the student cannot be crowned king.

Injustices should be corrected. Boards and administrators should provide for due process. The conviction that a system of justice prevails will do much for the stability and vitality of an institution. But absorption with issues of "student rights" almost certainly means diversion from the main task. Even due process is not in itself a creative factor. Like vaccination or vitamins, due process meets a special need. But it does not create good students, teachers or administrators.

Faculty and Student Board Membership

During the peak of campus unrest there was much pressure for students and faculty members as voting trustees. In response, a significant number of boards, both public and private, made arrangements for various forms of representation from these groups. More recently there have been serious second thoughts, and one significant piece of research on the results.* Millett, John D., *New Structures of Campus Power,* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977. "See also a review of this study: J.L.Z., "Something Ventured, Nothing Gained" *AGB Reports,* Nov.-Dec. 1978)

There seem to be two basic errors here: first, that faculty members are qualified to speak for the faculty/

* Millett, John D., *New Structures of Campus Power,* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977. (See also a review of this study: J.L.Z., "Something Ventured, Nothing Gained" *AGB Reports,* Nov.-Dec. 1978.)

trustee as a whole, whereas in fact they are typically concerned more with their own field of specialization. To avail itself of faculty wisdom, the board can develop devices such as a faculty relations committee. A faculty/trustee may serve as a symbol of participation, but not in substance. Conflict of interest problems arise when faculty members vote on institutional finances. Other problems can also arise from faculty participation in board-president discussions that must be treated confidentially.

The second basic error lies in the perception of students as residents of a sort of municipality with inherent right of self-government. The institution exists primarily for the students, but in quite specific terms—for their education. Educational consequence should determine all matters affecting students. Student participation in institutional matters is not immune from this consideration. How much can the student's education benefit from participation, and to how many students can this benefit be extended?

It may well be that students can offer useful opinions, but it does not follow that either the board or the student will necessarily benefit from membership on the board. The same basic objections made to faculty membership—conflict of interest, divergence of interests among the group themselves, and destructive impact on confidential discussions—also apply to student membership. As in the case of the faculty, common sense must search for the solution to student participation by finding a device by which student opinion can be sought and heard when the board wants it and when the students want to give it.

As for faculty representation, there is wide support for inviting faculty members from other institutions either to become members of the board or to serve on advisory committees, or a mixture of the two.

The most effective way of utilizing local faculty and students is by appointment to various study groups and advisory committees. When student or faculty advice is not followed, it is then important to offer a full explanation. But the board and administration must be prepared to make a firm and final decision, not to let restudy and referral continue too long, thus risking both exhaustion and temporary paralysis. At some point, decision becomes more important than consensus.

The Board and the Public

In both the public and private sectors, academic institutions serve a largely public function. They are agents of society in providing the continuity of knowledge and tradition, the development of skills, and the creation of new knowledge. In all these functions, the public well-being is at stake. And in one way or another, some element of the public will be offended by something being done in an institution.

What then should be the role of the board in maintaining public support and good will? Variations here are obvious as between different types of institutions. Community colleges maintain strong ties with the public through open meetings at times and places convenient to the constituency. At least one community college board schedules meetings in different centers of its suburban (Chicago) community for the express purpose of maintaining communications. For many public institutions on the other hand, sunshine laws have constituted a problem by inhibiting discussion of sensitive issues. The zeal of the media for conflict is a constant problem, but so is public apathy or failure to understand.

Some public boards have been known to retain public-relations officers. Wrong. If the president and the board do not form a cohesive unit with the president as the chief spokesperson, something is askew.

Nevertheless, it is true that the president and chairperson should develop a system whereby board actions receive proper public notice, so that the role and function of the board are made clear to the public. This is not a question of social or ceremonial type of publicity. There are occasions when the board needs to be spotlighted, when the institution is adopting a new direction or otherwise making some significant policy change. The occasion must be a matter of judgment by president and board.

III. Academic Trusteeship: Does It Have a Future?

The demise of lay governance has long been predicted and, by some, devoutly hoped for. Complaints against the system are often well founded. Yet so far no reasonable alternative has been offered. Comparisons of the American system with other national systems do not illuminate the landscape very well. In educational affairs, dissatisfaction is common to every system. Yet on balance it does appear that the American approach has been more productive than has any other. Whether that productivity can be attributed mainly to

lay governance or to the American commitment to education is open to debate. It does seem clear that governmental domination tends toward rigidity. And at the very least it appears that a plurality of systems is to be preferred over a massive single-structure system. There are certain distinctive problems yet to be resolved for the three major components of the public system in America; that is, for the multi-campus system, for the single-campus institution, and for the two-year community college. In the same way, the problems of the private sector can be seen as distinctive for the major university, for the non-sectarian college and for the church-related institution.

Yet the issues were never more important nor the stakes higher than at present. To the extent that citizen participation remains central to American institutions, as certainly as it should, the opportunity for trustees and regents is at peak.

One of the virtues attributed to lay governance is that it provides a safeguard against wide swings in program as the mood shifts in government, or in industry, or among the public. It has been suggested that during the time of Hitler the German universities would have been better served had they been based on lay governance rather than on purely governmental support and policy determination. One would certainly hope so. But to assume so, one must also assume a different history for Germanic institutions and for the German people as a whole. That is a puzzle yet to be solved.

In our own country, examples of extreme swings in the public mood are not hard to find, nor is it hard to find examples of administrators who have fallen before the pressures of a bad turn in public attitude. True, many of these victims have been later hailed as exemplars of leadership, post mortem so to speak.

Whatever its shortcomings, we continue to struggle with representative government, holding to a belief in the role of the citizen. The questions and issues now pressing upon the nation are new both in kind and in degree. To the extent that institutions of learning can fulfill their promise, they deserve the support and substantive involvement of people outside the academic profession.

IV. Variations and Addenda

In this final section are included a number of items which may be useful to different boards and individuals in different ways: a checklist of suggested items to be covered in the bylaws; a trustee audit; and a basic trusteeship bibliography, annotated and divided into institutional categories and issues.

Bylaws: Some Suggestions

- Election of members—self-perpetuating or appointed; nomination and election procedure; terms of office; filling vacancies
- Officers of board—appointed, ex officio, elected; nomination and election procedure; committee memberships; terms of office
- Meetings—time and place; notice; quorum; the annual meeting; attendance requirements
- Committees—executive, facilities, development, auditing, investment, academic policy, others; time and place of meetings; notice; quorum; selection of members
- Powers of committees—policy formulation; reports to full board
- Powers of president and other officials appointed or elected by board
- Procedure for communication between president and board; with other officials
- Requirements for reports of president and other officials
- Expenses of board members—limits; payment procedure
- Conflict of interest—definition; prohibitions
- Amendment to bylaws—procedure
- Indemnification

(Note: Available on request from AGB, Model Bylaws for various types of institutions.)

TRUSTEE AUDIT

The responsibilities of individual trustees are different from those of boards as corporate entities. The following checklist is designed to help board members assess the extent to which they have absorbed the breadth and depth of their roles and of their institutions. The questions seem somewhat imposing, but they are not intended to cause acute trustee or presidential depression. A "perfect score" is an unreasonable expectation.

Candid responses can be helpful to the design of orientation programs for new board members, or future workshops and retreats. The checklist can be adapted to the unique characteristics of your particular institution. It was developed by Richard T. Ingram, vice president of AGB, as part of *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship* (Jossey-Bass, 1980). The questions are the result of the scrutiny of a number of chief executives and trustees.

Background

	Yes	No	Somewhat or Sometimes
1. Do you feel you have adequate opportunity to understand your obligations, responsibilities and opportunities for growth as a *trustee*?	___	___	___
2. Have you a clear grasp of *your board's* responsibilities?	___	___	___
3. If you have answered yes to either or both questions, what has been the primary source(s) of your information? (e.g., an orientation program, a particular individual, a book, prior service as a board member.)			
_____			
_____			
_____			
4. Are you familiar with your institution's stated mission, institutional plan and current policies?	___	___	___
5. Do you stay abreast of higher education trends, legislation and other public policy by reading *AGB News Notes, The Chronicle of Higher Education, AGB Reports* or other material?	___	___	___
6. Have you recently taken an opportunity to meet with trustees and educators from other institutions?	___	___	___
7. Do you have adequate opportunities to know your fellow trustees?	___	___	___
8. Do you find any conflict between your responsibility for the welfare and advancement of your institution and your responsibility to the citizens of your region, state or nation?	___	___	___

9. What do you feel are your strongest areas of *expertise* based on your background and experience (x):

___ Budget/Finance	___ Student Affairs
___ Investments	___ Faculty Affairs
___ Management	___ Fund Raising
___ Planning	___ Public Relations
___ Legal Affairs	___ Marketing
___ Plant Management	___ Government Relations
___ Real Estate	___ Other: _____
___ Education	_____

10. Now go back and indicate any primary areas of *interest* outside of your areas of expertise (✓).

General Assessment

1. What issues have most occupied the board's time and attention during the past year?

2. What were the one or two successes during the past year for which the board feels some satisfaction?

3. What particular shortcomings do you see in the board's organization or performance that need attention?

4. Other comments or suggestions?

For Further Reference

From among the many publications in the field, the following have been selected for special notice. No one board member will be likely to read all, but each board member can benefit.

Many of the articles cited appeared in *AGB Reports*, a journal with which all trustees should be familiar. Back issues may be available in the library of AGB member institutions. Copies of these articles can be obtained from AGB at a cost of $3.00 each for AGB members ($2.00 each for 10 or more copies of an article), and $5.00 each for nonmembers ($4.00 each for 10 or more). Books bearing the designation [LL] are available to AGB members through the AGB Lending Library. They are mailed on request and may be kept for a period of two weeks.

Complete lists of AGB publications and Lending Library holdings are available from AGB.

A. Trusteeship in General

Bogue, E. O. and R. O. Riggs, "Institutional Policy and Its Abuses," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 45, No. 5 (May 1974)

Bowen, Howard R., "Manpower Management and Higher Education," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (November/December 1973)

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) [LL]*

Corson, John J., *The Governance of Colleges and Universities*, 2nd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) [LL]

Gomberg, Irene L. and Frank J. Atelsek, *Composition of College and University Governing Boards*, Higher Education Panel Report No. 35 (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1977)

Greenleaf, Robert K., *Trustees As Servants*, (Cambridge, Mass: Center for Applied Studies, 1974)

Heilbron, Louis H., *The College and University Trustee*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974) [LL]

Ikenberry, Stanley O., "The Organizational Dilemma," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 5 (February 1974)

Nason, John W., *The Future of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1975)

Perkins, James A., ed., *The University as an Organization* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) [LL]

Rauh, Morton A., *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969) [LL]

EFFECTIVE TRUSTEESHIP BIBLIOGRAPHY

*[LL]: Members may borrow copies through the AGB Lending Library.

Trivett, David A., *Goals for Higher Education: Definitions and Directions,* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973)

Zwingle, J. L. and William V. Mayville, *College Trustees: A Question of Legitimacy,* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974)

B. Private Colleges and Universities

Bean, Atherton, "The Liberal Arts College Trustee's Next 25 Years," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports,* Vol. 17, No. 6 (May/June 1975)

Cabot, Louis W., "We Should Support Colleges, Period," *AGB Reports,* Vol. 21, No. 3 (May/June 1979)

Calkins, Hugh, "A Plan for Survival," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports,* Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Minter, W. John and Howard R. Bowen, *Independent Higher Education: Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Education Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1978)

Warren, William H., "Smaller Can be Beautiful," *AGB Reports,* Vol. 20, No. 1 (January/February 1979)

C. State-Related Universities

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr., "Requiem or Renaissance for the New State College Trustees," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports,* Vol. 17, No. 7 (July/August 1975)

Fleming, R. W., "Governing Boards in Major Public Institutions," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports,* Vol. 17, No. 9 (November/December 1975)

Lyman, Glenny A. and Thomas K. Dalglish, *Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline* (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California/Berkeley, 1973)

Millett, John D., "What, No Governing Boards?" *AGB Reports,* Vol. 17, No. 9 (November/December 1975)

D. State Governing Boards and Multi-Campus Institutions

Corson, John J., "Boards vs. Superboards," *AGB Reports,* Vol. 21, No. 3 (March/April 1979)

Corson, John J., "Institutional Governance Within a System," *AGB Reports,* Vol. 16, No. 7 (April 1974)

Ostar, Allan W., "State Leadership in Postsecondary Education," *AGB Reports,* Vol. 16, No. 2 (October 1973)

E. Coordinating Boards

Berdahl, Robert, *Evaluating Statewide Boards*, New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 5 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975)

Enarson, Harold L., "The Occasional Search for the Public Interest," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

Norton, James A., "Who's Afraid of the Statewide Board?" *AGB Reports*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (January/February 1979)

Thomas, Wayne E., "What Makes A Good Statewide Board?" *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 5 (September/October 1976)

Van Dyne, Larry, "The Statewide Board: Hope or Threat?" *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Wilson, Logan, "External Governance in Higher Education: Bane or Boon?" An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

F. Community Colleges

Bender, Louis W., "Complaints From the Two-Year Colleges," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (July/August 1976)

Cosand, Joseph P., "The Community College in a New Period of Change," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

Goddard, Jeanne M. and Charles H. Polk, "Community College Trustees: Elect or Appoint?" *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (May/June 1976)

Harlacher, Ervin L. and James F. Gollattscheck, *New Directions for Community Colleges: Implementing Community-Based Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978)

Ingram, Richard T., "Trusteeship: An Overview," *Community and Junior College Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (October 1973)

Pray, Francis C., *A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Their Relationships* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975)

G. Presidential Search and Evaluation

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*, A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) [LL]

Fouts, Donald E., "Picking A President The Business Way," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (January/February 1977)

Hanley, Dexter L., S. J., "Evaluating a President," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

Hays, Garry D., "Evaluating A President: The Minnesota Plan," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 5 (September/October 1976)

Hays, Garry D., "Evaluating A President: Criteria and Procedures," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 6 (November/December 1976)

Kauffman, Joseph F., *The Selection of College and University Presidents* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974)

Munitz, Barry, "Measuring A President's Performance," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (January/February 1976)

Munitz, Barry, "Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Institutional Leadership," (March 1976). [Available from the AGB Trustee Information Clearinghouse]

Nason, John W., *Presidential Search:* A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1979)

Nason, John W., *Presidential Assessment: A Challenge to College and University Leadership* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980)

Reinert, Paul C., S. J., "The Problem with Search Committees," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 7 (April 1974)

Wessell, Nils Y., "Board-President Relationships: Second Thoughts," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 7 (April 1974)

Williams, Glenn D., "The Search for Dr. Perfect," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (July/August 1976)

H. Academic Affairs/Faculty Issues

Boyd, William W., "The Faculty Problem . . . Handle With Care," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 5 (September/October 1976)

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Making Affirmative Action Work In Higher Education* (San Francisco: Rossey-Bass, 1975)[LL]

Chait, Richard P., "Nine Alternatives to Tenure Quotas," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March/April 1976)

Chait, Richard P., "Much to do about Tenure," In *Three Views: Tenure*, edited by George W. Bonham (New York: Change Magazine Press, 1979)

Furniss, W. Todd, "The status of AAUP Policy," *Educational Record*, 59(1) (1978)

Martin, Harold C., "Trustees and Academic Policy," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (October 1974)

Morgan, F. Bruce, "Evaluating Teaching: Not Easy, Not Avoidable," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Tobias, Sheila, "A Guide to Affirmative Action," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

I. Accountability/Consumerism

Bailey, Stephen K., "The Limits of Accountability," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 8 (May/June 1973)

El-Khawas, Elaine H., "Toward a Statement of Fair Practice," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (July/August 1977)

Henry, David D., "Accountability: To Whom, For What, By What Means," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 5 (February 1973)

Johnson, Dennis L., "Marketing is not a Dirty Word," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (March/April 1979)

Stark, Joan S., "The Customers Are Right," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 9 (November/December 1975)

J. Collective Bargaining

Angell, George W. and Edward P. Kelley, Jr. and Associates, *Handbook on Faculty Bargaining* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977)

Bleicher, Michael N., "A Substitute for the Strike," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 6 (May/June 1975)

Bucklew, Neil, "Collective Bargaining: Three Campus Models," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Carr, Robert C. and Daniel K. Van Eyck, *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973) [LL]

Duryea, E. D., *Collective Bargaining: Impact on Governance* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1977)

Garbarino, Joseph W. and Bill Aussieker, *Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict*, Report to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) [LL]

Howe, Ray A., "Collective Bargaining: A Short Advanced Course," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

Kemerer, Frank R. and F. Victor Baldridge, *Unions on Campus* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975) [LL]

Potter, George E., "Collective Bargaining: A Primer for College Trustees," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

K. Faculty and Student Participation in Governance

Blandford, Barbara A., "Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards," *Higher Education Panel Survey No. 11* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972)

Martin, Harold C., "Pathologies of Participation," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (May/June 1974)

McIntyre, Valerie L., "Student Trustees: A New National Study," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (March/April 1977)

Millett, John D., *New Structures of Campus Power* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978)

Perlman, Daniel H., "Faculty Trusteeship," *Educational Record*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Spring 1973)

Priest, Eric M., "Student Trustees: The Illinois Experience," *AGB Reports, Vol. 19, No. 2 (March/April 1977)*

Shelton, Kathleen M., "The Growth of Student Trusteeship," AGB Reports, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March/April 1976)

Woods, Geraldine P. and John W. Nason, "Student-Faculty Trusteeship: A Short Debate," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (March/April 1977)

L. Resource Management

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and National Association of College and University Business Officers, *Financial Responsibilities of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C.: AGB and NACUBO, 1979)

Einnis, Richard M. and J. Peter Williamson, *Spending Policy for Educational Endowments* (New York: The Common Fund, 1976)

Ellis, R. L., "Managing the Endowment," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

Freeman, Jack E., "Trustees, Money and Planning," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 6 (November/December 1976)

Johnson, Franklyn A. and John A. Yngve, "Fiscal Policies: Procurement and Management of Resources," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (January 1974)

National Association of College and University Business Officers, *College and University Business Officer* (Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, 1974)

Rainsford, George N., "Two Plus Two Equals Five," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 7 (July/August 1975)

Smith, G. T., "Getting More from Private Givers," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Williamson, J. Peter, *Funds for the Future* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975)

M. Trustee Liability

Aiken, Ray J., "Tort Liability of Governing Boards, Administrators and Faculty in Higher Education," *Journal of College and University Law*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Winter 1974-75)

Aiken, Ray J., John F. Adams and John W. Hall, *Legal Liabilities in Higher Education: Their Scope and Management* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1976) [LL]

Hendrickson, Robert M. and Ronald S. Mangum, *Governing Board and Administrator Liability*, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1978)

Kaplin, William A., *The Law of Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978)

Porth, William C., "Personal Liability of Trustees of Educational Institutions," *Journal of College and University Law*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Winter 1973-74); excerpted in *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 9 (July/August 1974)

Porth, William C., "Personal Liability of Trustees of Higher Educational Institutions," *Journal of College and University Law*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Winter 1974-75)

Woodruff, Bruce E., "Trustees Must Know the Law!" *AGB Reports*, Vol. 18, No. 6 (November/December 1976)

Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle
Suite 720
Washington, DC 20036
202/296-8400

Designed by
Marlise Mason Longbottom